

Appropriation Act. In other words, this is the first instance where amendments to the Acts in question are proposed by way of statutory dollar items in the supplementary estimates rather than by the normal process of separate legislation.

• (2:20 p.m.)

These three items in votes 35C and 10C are clearly and unquestionably legislative in intent. There can be no suggestion that there is an attempt to dissimulate the purpose. This is clearly identified by the language of the items themselves.

The fourth item dealing with the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act is not as clear to me. I have spent considerable time attempting to ascertain the exact purpose of the item, and although there is strong evidence that the item might well be procedurally defective on the same basis as the items dealing with veterans legislation, the very complexity of the matter which has been alluded to by the hon. member for Edmonton West leads me to give the minister the benefit of the doubt in respect of item 7c. However, in relation to items 35c and 10c I must come to the inevitable conclusion that, in view of the situation created by the new rules, these items are not before the House in proper form.

It should be stressed that we are dealing now with an entirely new situation and with an entirely new set of circumstances. If it could be said that since the adoption of the amended Standing Orders in 1968 the House had already accepted as part of a continuing practice the consideration of dollar items intended to amend statutes, then the argument might be made that the procedure proposed in respect of these specific items conforms with a new practice and is supported by precedent. But that is not the case.

Since the adoption of the new rules, it seems there has been only one item with direct and specific legislative import that has been included in supplementary estimates. This particular item, included in the estimates for the year 1970-71, was allowed to go unchallenged and no point of order was raised in respect thereto. Thus, no practice has yet been established except perhaps that particular items proposing to amend directly and specifically a statute, have not been included in supplementary estimates since the rules were changed in 1968 but for the lone exception just mentioned. The House therefore has not had the opportunity at this point to reaffirm the proposition that such proposals, when they are clearly intended to amend existing legislation, should come to the House by way of an amending bill rather than as an item in the supplementary estimates.

I am not unaware of the possible delay in the adoption of the veterans legislation covered by items 35c and 10c by having the proposed amendments introduced by way of a bill. However, there is a long established practice in the House that veterans legislation is dealt with expeditiously on a non-partisan basis and it may well be that the House Leaders will want to agree to a timetable which will prevent any delay in the adoption of such

Supplementary Estimates

important measures. I would therefore suggest to the President of the Privy Council that his motion, amended to take into account this ruling, would be put in the following terms:

That the Supplementary Estimates (C) tabled in the House on March 4, 1971, with the exception of those items relating to Veterans Affairs, be referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, and that Veterans Affairs items 15c, 40c, 45c and 50c be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

I make this suggestion at this time to the President of the Privy Council. I hope he will find it possible to allow the Chair to put the motion in the terms I have just suggested.

Mr. MacEachen: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

OIL

NORTHERN PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION POLICY—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to make a motion under Standing Order 43 under the following circumstances. Recently, two members of the government have made major speeches and statements with regard to the question of the development of oil pipelines in Canada, the northern part of Canada in particular, which convey entirely opposite points of view. In order to set at rest the uncertainty and concern which these opposing statements have created and to find out what policy, if any, the government has, I ask leave to make the following motion:

That the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources be asked to appear together at the earliest possible date before a joint meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Peace River. Under the terms of Standing Order 43 the unanimous consent of the House is required before it can be put. Is there unanimity?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimity and the motion cannot be presented.